DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 567 HE 010 813

AUTHOR Mollenhauer, Emery C.
TITLE Observations on Off-Campus Credit Courses and Programs.
INSTITUTION La Salle Coll., Philadelphia, Pa.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy; Adult Education; *Articulation (Program); College Faculty; *College Planning; Curriculum Planning; Degrees (Titles); Enrollment; *Evening Programs; *Extension Education; Guidelines; Higher Education; Multicampus Colleges; Student Characteristics; *Transfer Policy
IDENTIFIERS Branch Campuses; *Middle States

ABSTRACT

A number of colleges and universities are providing greater access to higher education by developing off-campus programs and courses. A study of such off-campus activities offered for credit in the Middle States area draws on data from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools) survey and on information from interviews with administrators. Focus is on those educational activities that necessitate a student's matriculating eventually at the main campus to secure a degree. Included in the data summarized is information on enrollment, student characteristics, the likelihood of student transfers to the main campus, curriculum offerings, policies concerning the determination of curriculum, faculty selection criteria, faculty situation (regular full-time, non-regular, etc.), program administration, administrative autonomy, and resources, including libraries, computers, counseling, etc. Also presented are a few recommendations about the administration of off-campus units, transfer of students to the main campus, curriculum planning, the advisability of selecting as many full-time main campus faculty as possible, adequate planning for off-campus units, and realistic appreciation of library needs. (JMD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED165567

Observations on Off-Campus Credit Courses and Programs

Especially within the last ten years, a number of colleges and universities have attempted to provide greater access to higher education by developing off-campus programs and courses. In the fall, 1977, my own institution, a primarily undergraduate college with 3400 day and 2650 evening students, moved in that direction by offering college credit courses to 240 students in the evening at a high school located about thirteen miles from the main campus. In view of our inexperience with such programs, I undertook, during the spring, 1978, a modest study of off-campus programs and courses offered for credit in the Middle States area. In the following paragraphs, I attempt to summarize that study by offering some background information on off-campus activities in the Middle States area; by presenting descriptive information about the operational experience of such activities; and, perhaps presumptuously, by suggesting guidelines for the administration of off-campus programs and courses offered for academic credit. Although I will refer to a variety of off-campus educational activities, I am concerned particularly with such educational activities which necessitate a student's matriculating eventually at the main campus in order to secure a degree.

Procedure

In the spring, 1977, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education sent a twelve page survey questionnaire to the 452 accredited institutions and the 47 candidates for accreditation in the Middle States area concerning off-campus educational activities By June 30, 1977, 305 institutions had responded to the questionnaire. "Of these 193 or almost 40% of all institutions in the region and over two-thirds of the respondents reported off-campus activities." (Commission on Higher Education, Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, April 29, 1977, p. 19). The results of that survey, including paragraph analyses of individual sections of the survey, were graciously provided to me by administrative personnel of the Middle States Association.

HE010 813

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Emery C. Wallenhaus

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

While acknowledging the cooperation of the MSA personnel, I want also to indicate that this project was not commissioned or endorsed by the MSA.

After having reviewed the survey, I wrote to all responding institutions to request authorization to peruse the individual institutional responses. Over ninety percent of the 305 institutions which completed the questionnaire offered a positive response to my request.

Although the statistical information from the MSA questionnaire proved helpful, I would suggest that, like so many questionnaires which cross an administrator's desk these days, the quantitative information did not offer a clear picture of the operational situation of off-campus activities. Given the number of institutions involved in the MSA survey, I would hasten to add that the questionnaire could hardly be expected to be so inclusive that it would also embody details about administrative operations of individual institutions. Hence, after having reviewed individual survey responses of those institutions which agreed to my seeing their responses, I visited eighteen institutions in the Middle States area which offer off-campus programs and courses. The individual interviews with appropriate administrators substantially fleshed-out the survey; the portraits that emerged refined the lines and colors that were submerged in the grouped responses and also placed the statistical frame in more appropriate perspective. I admit that the number of institutions visited was limited; however, my impression is that there is a significant similarity operationally in the way institutions of higher education sponsor off-campus educational activities.

Nature and Scope of Off-Campus Educational Activities

Although my interest here is in off-campus educational activities in situations which necessitate a student's later matriculating on the main campus if he wishes to complete degree requirements, I believe it appropriate to suggest briefly the variety of off-

campus educational activities which exist in the Middle States area.

State-related universities have provided off-campus educational activities for many years. A more recent phenomenon on the higher education scene, the community colleges have almost from their beginnings also offered course work in settings separate from their main campuses. The mission of these two kinds of institutions is clearly related to such interests. More recently, some independent colleges and universities have extended their mission to off-campus clientele.

I might note further that state-related universities traditionally have had off-campus educational activities which provide complete degree programs on off-campus locations. In some states (e.g., New York) these are technically designated as "Branch Campuses." In addition to sponsoring as many as twelve regional or branch campuses which offer at least an Associate Degree, most of the state-related universities also offer off-campus activities for credit in locations which funnel out from the branch or regional campuses. One state-related institution provides courses for credit in fifty locations, which are separate from, though related to, the main regional campus. Most community colleges also offer courses in locations other than the main campus; one community college in the Middle States area has four major regional campuses and 250 "centers" which are related to the major campuses.

The problem of focusing on off-campus collegiate courses is further complicated by the differences in terminology used to designate such courses and programs. For example, there is a federal definition for "branch campus," which specifies that a branch campus "offers an organized program or programs of work of at least two years (as opposed to courses). . ." (Education Directory, Colleges and Universities, U.S. Department of Education, 1976-1977, p. XV). Individual states, however, have both more specific and more general descriptive definitions of branch campuses. The problem of the variety of descriptive terms for these course offerings is suggested further by the spring, 1977,

Middle States Association questionnaire. In that survey, there were listed thirteen terms intended to describe off-campus programs: Extension Programs, Separate Units, Branch Campuses, External Degree, Weekend College, Study Abroad, Military Base, Satellite Campus, Correspondence Course, Non-Credit Programs, Learning Centers, Off-Campus Semesters, and Continuing Education. MSA responses designate programs for all of these terms with the number of campuses sponsoring such programs varying from eight (Separate Units) to eighty-five (Extension Programs) (MSA Survey, p. 2). What is more, an additional forty-seven campuses are described by respondees in supplementary terms: Internships, Clinical, Student Teaching, Off-Campus. One other problem is that the Middle States questionnaire did not distinguish between credit and non-credit offerings among the varied designations for off-campus educational activities.

Further, I think it worth pointing out that a number of institutions offer both undergraduate and graduate credit programs and courses "on-site." These programs and courses are often inaugurated at the request of a group or their employer and may vary from an individual course to a complete program which is "taught" at a military base, a hospital, a business location, a police center, or the like.

Perhaps the scope of these activities can best be summarized by excerpting two paragraphs from the commentary provided by the Middle States Association on its spring, 1977, survey:

> There have been unsubstantiated reports of a dramatic increase in the number of off-campus educational activities. The great number of off-campus programs may be attributable to several factors. Outreach efforts may be attempting to compensate for decreasing enrollments at the main campus; colleges are becoming increasingly willing to experiment with non-traditional modes of learning. Student demand and community service are factors as well. Educational entrepreneurship cannot be discounted. . . .
>
> If the results of this survey are extrapolated to the region, then it may be said that off-campus activities have grown to the point

> where they are a significant activity. The reasons for this development, in the words of the respondents, include student demand, institutional mission, and the legitimization of heretofore "non-traditional" modes of study (MSA Survey, p. 19).

The focus of the Middle States questionnaire was on "programs." According to the survey, 193 campuses reported 21,163 programs, and 90% of these were concentrated in three areas:

Extension	10,995	85 campuses
Non-credit	4,831	66 campuses
Continuing	3,610	59 campuses

Consortia programs were indicated by 47 institutions; contractual programs, 165 institutions (MSA Survey, p. 19).

Unfortunately, the MSA survey does not consistently distinguish between credit and non-credit programs; a number of institutions offer both credit and non-credit courses in extension campuses, for example. The immediately preceding data, however, as well as the data in the survey concerning establishment of programs, clearly suggest that more programs are for credit than for non-credit.

Enrollment

According to the responses to the MSA survey, enrollment in off-campus programs during the 1976-1977 academic year totaled 3,190,820 "of which over 90% is part-time." Since 2.5 million of these enrollments are attributable to enrollees in community service programs in one land-grant institution, the more realistic summary on enrollment would be that almost 700,000 enrollees participated in programs on 192 campuses. Fewer than 1,000 were enrolled in 138 (or over one-half) of the total campuses (MSA Survy, p. 3).

One significant footnote seems appropriate here: the MSA information that one institution reported 2.5 million enrollments suggests a definition problem which all of us in administration probably have encountered. The land-grant institution which listed

2.5 million enrollees "counted" individuals who attended community service workshops, conferences, seminars, and the like. Some of these enrollees attended several such educational activities sponsored by the same institution, and a number of these educational activities were a few days in length. Clearly, then, the total number of enrollments is, in a sense, accurate, but it also may be misleading.

Responses to the MSA questionnaire indicate that most (101 or 58%) of these educational activities have fewer than 500 students. Among the eighteen institutions I have visited, I found enrollments in off-campus programs and courses which do not comprise a complete degree curriculum (e.g., those offered in high schools, community centers, hospitals, and the like) typically enroll between 150 and 300 students.

Further, although some institutions offer credit courses throughout the day and evening, most off-campus courses for credit are directed toward the part-time student who attends in the evening and, occasionally, on weekends. A few institutions in the branch campus category have thriving enterprises during the day, populated principally by housewives.

Perhaps predictably, among the eighteen campuses I visited the clientele were older than their day school counterparts. Additionally, the criteria for admissions to the off-campus programs were comparable to those in effect on the individual campuses for the evening and/or part-time students of the institution. I might note further here the assessment of some off-campus administrators concerning the success of their programs: Convenient access to the courses and programs, and, through familiarity with the locations, significant diminution of the fear-of-college syndrome.

On the other hand, the dependence on familiarity with surroundings entails a substantial drawback: Most of the administrators I encountered admitted that off-campus students attending courses in community surroundings are unlikely to transfer to the main campus. Although most administrators and faculty are interested in encouraging

such transfers, the estimates of administrators who had pursued this question, suggest that hardly more than thirty percent of such off-campus students eventually move to the main campus for a degree. I might recognize in this regard that a substantial number of students in off-campus locations are primarily interested in a limited and specific number of courses and do not have a full degree program as an objective.

Curriculum

Parenthetically at this point, I would observe that some universities offer graduate programs on off-campus sites. In a few instances, the number of graduate enrollees on off-campus sites, as well as on the main campus, is greater than the number of undergraduate enrollees.

Undergraduate credit-bearing courses and programs which are offered in high schools and other community locations tend to be concentrated in basic course areas. That is, typically, introductory courses that serve the main campus are duplicated at the off-campus sites. Career or professionally oriented courses also characterize the curricula of these campuses. What is more, many programs include courses which respond to the present interest of the clientele at the off-campus locations. In the final section of this paper, I will comment on one facet of off-campus curricular offerings which I believe warrants attention: the need to marshal resources -- in a word, to concentrate or limit programs -- in order to see that off-campus courses and programs are academically attractive and well-planned, as well as economically feasible.

Concerning the determination of curriculum, the Middle States survey indicates that:

> Policies and regulations affecting off-campus credit programs, as well as actual programs, are implemented after appropriate review by faculty and institutional policy makers. Over 70% reported faculty involvement; 70% reported authorization by policy making groups; 90% reported that policies were formulated the same way as on-campus policies (MSA Survey, p. 20).

Among the campuses I visited, courses are usually determined by the administrator of the off-campus program in consultation with the chairperson of the main campus and with the approval of the appropriate dean of the main campus. My impression is that off-campus administrators who have modest enrollments find this procedure satisfactory. Some of those with more substantial enrollments (i.e., over 400) find this procedure inhibiting and observe also that occasionally the main campus administrators do not understand and/or appreciate the off-campus situation.

Faculty

Although the overwhelming majority of campus respondents to the Middle States questionnaire indicated that "faculty and staff for off-campus credit programs were selected according to the same criteria as those for on campus programs" (p. 20), some respondents noted that different criteria apply in the selection of faculty and staff for off-campus programs offered for credit. These "different" criteria were indicated as applicable:

Terminal degree:	13
Teaching experience:	27
Research and publication record:	5
Practical experience:	29

(MSA Survey, p. 6).

The following commentary included in the Middle States report summarizes the faculty situation in off-campus educational activities:

> Although the vast majority of the faculty used for off-campus programs were part-time and recruited from outside the institutions, campuses reported significant participation of regular full-time faculty. Faculty participation totaled as follows for 1976-1977:
>
> | | Credit | Non-Credit |
> |---|---|---|
> | Regular full-time faculty | 2,008 | 1,457 |
> | Full-time non-regular | 100 | 89 |
> | Part-time non-regular | 22 | 3,334 |
>
> Full-time personnel in off-campus programs are most frequently on the same salary scale as other comparable personnel. Part-time credit personnel are usually paid on a credit hour basis and non-credit personnel on a contact hour basis. . . .

> There appears to be as great care taken in the recruitment and hiring of off-campus professionals as for the on-campus staff. The vast majority of the personnel engaged in off-campus programs are part-time and not members of the regular institutional faculty (MSA survey, p. 21).

In discussions with off-campus administrators, I found that the assignment of faculty to off-campus programs is generally done through the administrator of the off-campus activity in consultation with the appropriate chairpersons and, ordinarily, also with the approval of the appropriate dean. Most institutions have an impressive file of potential faculty for specific courses and programs. In determining the faculty assignments, the off-campus administrator informs the chairpersons of personnel needs, and the chairpersons nominate the faculty for specific teaching assignments. An exception to this occurs in some large universities where the administrator of the off-campus programs has little or no control over the appointment of personnel to his staff. In a word, the situation for the appointment of faculty is very similar to the procedure for the determination of curriculum.

Administration

Respondents to the Middle States questionnaire indicate that over 80% of institutions which have off-campus programs shepherd those programs in an identifiable administrative unit. "Most frequently, 75% of the time, the unit had the phrase "continuing education" in its name. The title of the administrative officer in charge of the unit varied, but most often was director or dean of continuing education " (MSA survey, p. 20).

Ordinarily, the administrator of the off-campus unit reported directly to the dean or vice president for academic affairs at the main campus and was responsible to him for programs, personnel, and budget. "A significant number of continuing education officials reported directly to the president. . . ." (MSA Survey, p. 20).

Among the institutions I observed, administrative autonomy varies considerably, depending to a large extent on the size of the institution and on the kinds of programs offered. In state-related institutions, there seems to be less administrative autonomy in the management of large and even degree-conferring programs than exists in independent, for the most part, smaller institutions that sponsor off-campus units which feature fewer programs, courses, and students. As I will note further in the prescriptive section at the end of this paper, the main observation I have about administration is that some institutions might want to assure academic integrity more effectively and strengthen morale of off-campus professional personnel by their top administrators' having more awareness of and interest in the institution's off-campus programs.

There is also significant variation in the administration of off-campus programs in terms of personnel and their duties. In the self-contained or branch campus units I visited, a kind of superdean or "president" (the term is official for the top administrators of branch campuses of one university) presides with professional personnel similar to those who would administer a not-so-small college. The personnel situation in off-campus units which are not self-contained is markedly more diverse. I found that one large off-campus unit (1,000 students) has two full-time administrators and two secretaries. In the more typical off-campus unit where the student population varies from 150 to 450, these situations exist: a director may coordinate off-campus activities and be assisted by two field persons who visit off-campus units; two institutions, each with off-campus units of 400 students, have no on-site administrator and have indicated that they find telephone contacts with the off-campus units satisfactory; more typically,it seems that off-campus units of 150 to 400 student population have one or more faculty or comparable professionals who serve as liaisons administratively with the main campus.

Resources

In the Middle States summary findings, there is a succinct statement on educational services: "Off-campus students are not being denied access to educational facilities and services which are essential to their learning process " (p. 21). The final question of the MSA section on services concerns whether library, computer, academic advisement and counseling facilities are comparable in off-campus credit programs to what is available to students on the main campus. 61% (108 of 160) answered affirmatively.

The one service resource that seems not to have been addressed adequately thus far in off-campus programs is the library. In the MSA survey, 180 of 183 respondents indicated that students in their degree programs have access to library facilities, specifying the main institution's library, libraries of other institutions, and public libraries (p.8). Administrators whom I spoke with, however, were almost unanimously candid about the drawback of not having a library on-site. The problem is that it is not reasonable or financially possible to open a separate library service for each off-campus location. Those institutions which have a self-contained degree program do, for the most part, have complete library facilities on their campuses.

Administrators of off-campus programs and their sponsoring institutions do try to respond to the need for the essential educational resource which is the library. These attempts vary from encouraging students to use the main campus library; providing reserved shelves in local libraries; promoting students' use of local libraries; supplying minimal library materials at the off-campus site; and, where appropriate, negotiating for students to use industrial libraries. Admittedly, the library problem is less acute in the off-campus locations in which certain introductory courses (e.g., Accounting) are featured; on the other hand, the academic integrity of the total offerings and indeed of the main institution may be jeopardized by the inadequacy of library materials at many off-campus sites. In the final section of this paper,

I will comment briefly on the advisibility of associating curriculum on off-campus sites with the availability of library resources.

Although access to a computer for course related work is an increasing need in many institutions, administrators whom I spoke to did not suggest a problem in this service area. Besides the fact that the existence of courses in computer science would seem to imply access to a computer, students taking such courses would, I believe, be well motivated to avail themselves of the main institution's computer, as well as other institutions' and business and industry computer facilities.

The MSA survey responses concerning availability of academic advisement and counseling in off-campus credit programs are overwhelmingly positive (181 of 182 institutions indicated academic advisement occurs; 162 of 188, counseling). My impression of the institutions I visited is that academic advisement is the strongest service available in off-campus programs and that that service may well be more effective in off-campus situations than it is on the main campus. It seems likely that the more personal environment in the off-campus sites, as well as the more limited programs and courses, leads to this success

Other services which off-campus units provide rather consistently are financial aid and veterans' services; less consistently, reading and speech clinics, health services and housing.

Finally concerning services, I found that off-campus units have very few extra-curricular or cocurricular activities. I hasten to add that, according to administrators I interviewed, there is little or no demand for or interest in such services.

Recommendations

Obviously enough, much of this paper has been descriptive. I have surveyed a rather large forest and already have been out on a few limbs. In the section that

follows, I present a few recommendations about off-campus credit-bearing educational activities. While I recongize the hazard of attempting to be prescriptive, especially since my incursions into institutions which offer off-campus units has been limited, I venture these observations because (a) some assessment seems to me inevitable and probably appropriate; and (b) my own administrative experience (eight years as an Evening Division Dean and nine years as an Academic Vice President or Provost) might imply that such conclusions may not be too audacious.

Location

Although I have not commented earlier on locations of off-campus units, I believe that determination of where to inaugurate an off-campus unit warrants some remark. I have two observations here, one relates to relationships with other institutions and the other concerns some factors associated with zeroing in on a specific location for an off-campus unit.

Before the 1970s, state-related institutions and community colleges opened off-campus units which were, for the most part, located in areas where access to the opportunity of higher education was not convenient. In more recent years, some state-related institutions and community colleges, as well as some independent institutions, responding to perceptions of possibilities for new clientele and/or community services, have opened off-campus sites in geographic areas proximate to other institutions of higher education. Given the increasing alertness to the projected crunch in enrollment in colleges and universities, colleges and universities have become, predictably, sensitive to incursions on their "turf." State departments of education have been aware of this and have increasingly taken initiative toward formulating policies and procedures which through regionalization would attempt to assure more coordination of such efforts. Admittedly, this is a difficult assignment. Institutions of higher education have been increasingly inundated with extra-mural controls at a time when

many of those institutions are striving to seek creative ways to endure. What is more, many institutions may perceive potential clientele who might be attracted to their institutional image and programs in locations which may be within "reasonable" distance to existing institutions. While state efforts toward coordination of college and university programs will probably continue, those institutions which might plan off-campus units and, in some instances, those which already have such units in locations proximate to existing institutions, will want to consider the advantages of communicating in advance of establishment of an off-campus unit with other institutions which might regard the inauguration of an off-campus unit as an intrusion on their turf.

Unfortunately, this is a complicated issue in which the rhetoric of regionalization does not always match the argot of experience. For example, some of the leaders in regionalization plans have been known to initiate off-campus units in recent years without any direct discussion with institutions which have programs already in the region where the new units have been opened. Again, however, the institution taking the initiative in this regard may perceive its action as directed toward service and/or survival.

From the institutions I visited, my impression is that determination of a location for an off-campus site is, for the most part, a decision based on good sense and intuition. True, many institutions conduct market studies before launching a new off-campus unit. I would point out here that, although at least three deans mentioned to me that such studies are necessary for committees and Boards of Trustees, in their experience such studies entailed the use of time and resources that were difficult to vindicate. For example, an administrator of several off-campus units pointed out that potential students, when canvassed about whether they would take specific courses or programs at an off-campus location, offered overwhelmingly positive responses. When the institution followed through on what was interpreted as need and interest of

potential clientele, there emerged a significant gap between the conclusions of the survey and the actual enrollments on the off-campus unit. While I do not wish to denigrate the role of market studies, which, I think, will actually become increasingly important in decisions for initiating off-campus units, I intend to point out that the data they may supply should not be interpreted as infallible; the experience and common sense of the decision makers would seem to be an important supplement to such studies.

Students

I'd like to comment briefly on the nature of the off-campus student and on one related topic, the problem of transferring to the main institution.

In general, I think it accurate to suggest that the off-campus student will be an older person, one whose age is comparable to the part-time evening student on the main campus. Although I do not have data to shepherd this conclusion, I believe that women students predominate in off-campus units. These students ordinarily are interested in pursuing specific course objectivees, most often in areas which will lead to their personal or professional development. A further comment on characteristics of off-campus students will be made in the section on curriculum.

As I noted earlier in this paper, transfers to the main institutions are not so frequent as most administrators would want. In this regard, I would suggest that the objective of increasing the number of transfers to the main campus might be enhanced by (a) initial and persistent encouragement of the off-campus student to enrich his educational experience by completing studies on the main campus; and (b) as I will note in more detail in the next section, better correlation of off-campus courses and programs with the objectives and interests of the clientele.

Curriculum

My observations here, as well as elsewhere, are not intended to imply that these recommendations are applicable or needed among the institutions I visited; rather, they are directed toward establishing some guidelines for administrators of off-campus units.

Some disappointment in setting-up courses and programs for an off-campus unit might be avoided by prudent marshalling of resources. That is, by their nature off-campus units, for the most part, do not have the same number of students as does the main campus. Hence, courses and programs cannot be so extensive as they are on the main campus. Those off-campus units which seem successful have focused their offerings on a limited number of courses and programs. I would suggest that operationally this might be achieved by outlining specific courses which will be offered over "x" number of semesters on the off-campus site. There is the added advantage here that the student has a sense of direction concerning course work and hence has the psychological reenforcement of moving toward his objective. Given the limited number of students in off-campus units, this assumes that administrators will have to decide which courses will prove attractive and are also appropriate for the particular program. Further, in practice this means that not all General Education courses can be given simultaneously at an off-campus unit. One other conclusion about curriculum seems valid: Professionally oriented programs appear to be particularly attractive to the off-campus student; thus, in initiating an off-campus program, an administrator might consider a paradigm of course work leading to an associate degree in accounting or computer science.

Faculty

The one recommendation I have concerning faculty is this: The more full-time, main campus faculty who teach in the off-campus unit, the better. Besides providing a

leaven of professional academics for the off-campus unit, full-time faculty who have a section or two in the off-campus unit -- whether as part of their regular schedule or as a one-course overload — aid significantly in giving a sense of academic credibility to the off-campus enterprise. It is not uncommon that within a sponsoring institution off-campus offerings are regarded with some suspicion. Clearly, the informal or formal exchange among faculty of positive experiences in the off-campus unit through their most respected colleagues can do immensely more toward sanguine acceptance of the off-campus unit and its academic standards than can any administrator's efforts in that regard. Additionally, the more regular, full-time faculty who teach in the off-campus unit, the easier it will be to coordinate objectives of the main institution with the off-campus unit and to evaluate the academic standards which exist in the off-campus enterprise.

Administration

Administrators of off-campus units whom I met impressed me as dedicated, energetic, and often creative persons. Inevitably, some had recommendations related to their own association with the main institution. In the section on "Faculty" in this paper, I have alluded to the occasional uneasiness experienced by off-campus administrators who believe that they should be able to exercise more autonomy and initiative in assigning faculty and in determining courses and programs. These matters, however, concern internal institutional policy, and hence I believe any gloss on my part would be gratuitous.

Especially in the area of administration, it is hazardous to generalize. Acknowledging that, I would offer two recommendations which seem to me applicable to a few of the institutions I visited. These concern long-range planning and what might loosely be designated as "attitudes."

I believe that priority should be given in the main campus to coordination of and long-range planning for off-campus units. Occasionally, it would seem that individual off-campus units are inaugurated with rather minimal planning. The coordination and planning, of course, include communications and some study of the effects of an off-campus unit on the main institution. Probably, the main agenda items for such co-ordination and planning include availability of faculty, decisions on courses and programs, and provision of educational resources. Somewhat parenthetically, I should recognize that budget questions would obviously be pertinent; because of the confidential nature of that issue, I did not attempt to inquire about finances of off-campus units in my visits to campuses. I did learn, however, that the larger off-campus units are more than self-sustaining. Further, at least two off-campus administrators volunteered the remark that, where enrollments in off-campus units are not substantial, it is difficult for the units to be self-sustaining financially. This is related rather directly to the retention situation; thus, the resources, personnel, and time of the admissions and registrar's offices are necessitated for enrolling each student, whether he remains a few weeks, a semester, or actually pursues a degree. One administrator of a large off-campus unit stated that, given the drain on administrative personnel, an institution must enroll three off-campus students for cost equivalency of enrolling one student who perseveres to at least an associate degree.

Concerning "attitudes" toward off-campus educational activities, I have in mind the relationship of such activities to the prevailing mind on the main campus. While some branch campuses can point with pride to data which indicate that the entrance credentials of their students are more impressive than those of the students on the main campus, initially at least, faculty especially may regard off-campus educational activities as enterprises which vitiate the academic integrity of the total institution. I have already suggested that this syndrome may be addressed by seeing that the

most reputable faculty teach at the off-campus unit. When transfers to the main campus occur, the performance of students in the main campus situation is also important in creating attitudes which positively re-enforce the off-campus operations.

Perhaps the most negative observation I have about the relationship of the administration of the main campus within the context of off-campus activities is that I found at least two top academic administrators who suggested little interest in and minimal knowledge of the off-campus educational activities which they were ultimately responsible for.

Resources

As I have noted previously, except for library services, educational services seem to be effectively addressed in off-campus units.

I must admit that I have no significant recommendations about remedying the inadequacy of library resources at off-campus units. Some administrators suggested that business and industrial libraries serve for certain studies better than does the campus library; I would assume that such would be an exception to the bibliographic needs of most off-campus enrollees. Even some off-campus units which enroll as many as a thousand students do not have immediately available to those students the resources of an adequate library.

I would suggest that, until this problem is more successfully solved, administrators would be well-advised to plan courses and programs with realistic appreciation of appropriate library work involved in such courses and programs. Thus, quantitatively and professionally oriented courses would lend themselves more to off-campus situations than would courses in the humanities and social sciences. Before courses in the humanities and social sciences are rostered, faculty should be canvassed to determine the feasibility of individual course offerings within the focus of appropriate readings beyond the textbooks.

Evaluation

Those institutions which have had some years of experience with branch campuses, on-site courses, and off-campus units have had the opportunity to assess the academic integrity of their courses and programs. Such information is internal to the individual institution. My impression is that two factors are especially important in this regard: the reaction of experienced, full-time faculty and the performance of students when they transfer to the main campus. These two means of assessment are, of course, applicable to institutions which have more recently inaugurated such courses and programs.

I would anticipate that off-campus units will increase in the next five years, though their establishment will be monitored by state educational agencies and accrediting bodies more than in previous years. These educational activities do serve a real need of individuals who probably would not otherwise continue their studies. Finally, I would suggest that, if off-campus units increase significantly, the concept of "going to college" will change. The resonance of a full array of student services currently associated with the stereotype of a degree-granting institution will be affected by the future of off-campus educational activities offered for academic credit.